

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hezel (EP 1 129 828) or Larsson (USP 4,904,148) in view of Akeel (USP 5,293,107).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that “each of the joint arms is disposed coaxially.” This amendment is supported in Figs. 1 and 2, and paragraphs [0030] - [0035] in the specification. No new matter has been added. Hezel does not recognize the need for, and fails to teach, a robot having each of the joint arms disposed coaxially. Larsson, as shown in FIGS. 2 and 4, also fails to teach or suggest a robot having each of the joint arms disposed coaxially. Akeel, which the Examiner cited for allegedly teaching a motor and gear arrangements, fails to cure the deficiency of Hezel and Larsson, because Akeel does not teach or suggest a robot having each of the joint arms disposed coaxially. Thus, there is no prima facie case of obviousness over the combination of Hezel or Larsson and Akeel. Independent claim 1 is patentable over Hezel or Larsson in view of Akeel.

Claim 2 is dependent from claim 1; and claim 2 is patentable for at least the same reasons as set forth above in connection with independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 22, 2008

By: 

Jin Zhang

Reg. No. 62,549

Direct: (650) 849-6677

Filed Via - EFS WEB